

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 27, 2005. Claims 46 to 109 are pending in the application, with new Claims 96 to 109 having been added. Claims 46, 49, 52, 57 and 59 to 95 have been amended, and Claims 46, 49, 52, 57 and 59 to 68 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 46, 48 to 53, 56 to 67 and 70 to 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over WO 95/35534 (Combaluzier) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,459 (Redford). Claim 47 was rejected under § 103(a) over Combaluzier in view of Redford, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,015,830 (Masuzawa). Claims 54, 55, 68 and 69 were rejected under § 103(a) over Combaluzier in view of Redford, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,202 (Cohn). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 46, 49 and 65

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 46 as amended is directed to a card customizing apparatus for customizing a card adapted for insertion into a card reader which communicates with a computer device, the card comprising selectable indicia on a surface of the card, and a storage device storing, for each indicium, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment. Selection of one of the indicia while the card is inserted into the reader causes the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium. The apparatus comprises a processor configured to write the plurality of commands into the storage device of the card.

Independent Claim 49 as amended is directed to a card adapted for insertion into a card reader which communicates with a computer device. The card comprises selectable indicia on a surface of the card, and a storage device storing, for each indicium, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment. Selection of one of the indicia while the card is inserted into the reader causes the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium.

Independent Claim 65 as amended is directed to a card adapted for insertion into a card reader which communicates with a computer device that communicates with equipment external to the card over a network. The card comprises selectable indicia on a surface of the card, and a storage device storing, for each indicium, a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment. Selection of one of the indicia, while the card is inserted into the reader, provides a service based upon performance of the function by the equipment, the function being associated with the selected indicium.

A feature of the invention of Claims 46, 49 and 65 therefore lies in storing, for each selectable indicium on a surface of a card, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, wherein selection of one of the indicia while the card is inserted into a reader causes the equipment to perform the function (or provides a service based upon performance of the function) corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium. The applied references of Combaluzier, Redford, Masuzawa and Cohn are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As understood by Applicants, Combaluzier discloses a control unit consisting of a touch-sensitive keypad, a display, and an operating system. The unit has a slot for a smart card used to activate the unit, and the keypad comprises a number of touch-

sensitive keys made of transparent material so that the underlying inserted smart card is visible. The back surface of the smart card, which contacts the keypad, includes a set of customized indicia each corresponding to one touch-sensitive key on the keypad, and each of the smart card indicia represents the function assigned to the corresponding key. See Combaluzier, Abstract.

Page 3 of the Office Action asserts that Combaluzier (page 3, line 26 to page 4, line 21, page 5, lines 1 to 7 and page 6, line 14 to page 9, line 27) discloses a card reader which obtains the selected information dependent upon selection of the indicium (when the user presses one of the keys 13) and sends the information to the other device.

However, nowhere is Combaluzier seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of the card.

In particular, Combaluzier is only seen to disclose that a single command associated with a pressed indicium is performed. More specifically, the command is to perform the function represented by the “ideagram” (i.e., symbol) on the indicium. See Combaluzier, Figure 6, page 3, line 26 to page 4, line 2 and page 7, lines 18 to 25. Thus, as understood by Applicants, even though Combaluzier’s system may perform with multiple cards, only one command is sent each time an indicium is pressed.

Accordingly, Combaluzier is not seen to disclose or suggest storing, for each selectable indicium on a surface of a card, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, wherein selection of one of the indicia while the card is inserted into a reader causes the equipment to perform the function (or provides a service based upon performance of the function) corresponding to the plurality of commands associated

with the selected indicium.

Redford is not seen to remedy the shortcomings of Combaluzier. As understood by Applicants, Redford discloses a remote control unit with a base and an insert that is attached in a detachable manner to the base. The insert includes a printed publication (such as a sheet of paper) containing at last one leaf having human-understandable content. The user attaches the insert to the fastener so that the human-understandable content is laid over at least one button. When the user operates the button by touching the leaf, the base transmits a remote control signal. In particular, the remote control device sends a signal to a remote server consisting of the x-y coordinates of the location touched by the user, and an identifier for the inserted leaf. A host device then displays information related to the text or graphics on the leaf at the touched location. See Redford, Abstract and Column 4, lines 11 to 16 and 54 to 63. In addition, Redford is seen to suggest that each indicium corresponds to a single command, in particular a command to retrieve content corresponding to the text or graphics at the indicium pressed. See Redford, Column 4, lines 16 to 24, Column 8, lines 40 to 49 and Column 9, lines 10 to 16.

Thus, while Redford's system allows for the use of multiple pages, Redford is not seen to disclose more than one command at all, muchless that more than one command is associated with each indicium on the card. As such, Redford is not seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of the card.

As such, even if Combaluzier and Redford are combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be permissible), the result would not teach at least the feature of storing, for each selectable

indicium on a surface of a card, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, wherein selection of one of the indicia while the card is inserted into a reader causes the equipment to perform the function (or provides a service based upon performance of the function) corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium.

In addition, Masuzawa and Cohn have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Combaluzier and Redford.

Allowance of Claims 46, 49 and 65 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 52 and 66

Independent Claim 52 as amended is directed to a card reader for a card, the card reader communicating with a computer device communicating with equipment over a network, the card being configured for insertion into the card reader, and wherein the card has indicia formed on a surface thereof. The card reader comprises a processor for (i) obtaining from a storage device on the card a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment, the plurality of commands being associated with a selected one of the indicia of the card, and (ii) sending the plurality of commands to the computer device to thereby cause the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium.

Independent Claim 66 as amended is directed to a card reader for a card, the card reader communicating with a computer device that communicates with equipment external to the card over a network, the card being adapted for insertion into the card reader, the card comprising selectable indicia on a surface of the card, and a storage device for storing, for each indicium, a plurality of commands related to a function of the

equipment. The card reader comprises a processor adapted for (i) obtaining, while the card is inserted into the reader and upon selection of one of the indicia, the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, and (ii) sending the plurality of commands to the computer device to thereby obtain a service based upon performance of the function by the equipment, the function being associated with the selected indicium.

Thus, among its many features, the invention of Claims 52 and 66 provides for (i) obtaining a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, the plurality of commands being associated with a selected indicium of a card, and (ii) sending the plurality of commands to a computer device to thereby cause the equipment to perform the function (or to obtain a service based upon performance of the function) corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium. The applied references of Combaluzier, Redford, Masuzawa and Cohn are not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

As noted above, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of a card.

As such, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest (i) obtaining a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, the plurality of commands being associated with a selected indicium of a card, and (ii) sending the plurality of commands to a computer device to thereby cause the equipment to perform the function (or to obtain a service based upon performance of the function) corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium.

In addition, Masuzawa and Cohn have been reviewed and are not seen to

compensate for the deficiencies of Combaluzier and Redford.

Allowance of Claims 52 and 66 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 57, 61 and 62

Independent Claim 57 as amended is directed to a computer device for communicating with a card reader that receives a card, the computer device communicating with equipment external to the card, the card having indicia formed thereon. The computer device comprises a processor for receiving from the card reader a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment, the plurality of commands being (i) stored in a storage device on the card and associated with a selected one of the indicia and (ii) used in the computer device to thereby cause the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium.

Independent Claim 61 as amended is directed to a method in a computer device for communicating with a card reader that receives a card, the card having indicia formed on a surface thereof, the computer device communicating with a equipment external to the card. The method comprises the step of receiving from the card reader a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment, the plurality of commands being stored in a storage device on the card and being associated with a selected one of the indicia and being used in the computer device to thereby cause the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium.

Independent Claim 62 as amended is directed to a computer program which is seen to generally correspond with Claim 61.

A feature of the invention of Claims 57, 61 and 62 therefore lies in

receiving from a card reader a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, the plurality of commands being stored in a storage device on the card and being associated with a selected indicium and being used in a computer device to thereby cause the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium. The applied references of Combaluzier, Redford, Masuzawa and Cohn are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As noted above, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of a card.

As such, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest receiving from a card reader a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, the plurality of commands being stored in a storage device on the card and being associated with a selected indicium and being used in a computer device to thereby cause the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium.

In addition, Masuzawa and Cohn have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Combaluzier and Redford.

Allowance of Claims 57, 61 and 62 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 59 and 60

Independent Claim 59 as amended is directed to a card customizing method for customizing a card to be used in a card reader, the card having indicia formed on a surface thereof, and the card reader communicating with a computer device that communicates with equipment external to the card. The method comprises the step of

writing, in regard to each indicium, a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment, the plurality of commands being associated with each indicia and being used in the computer device to thereby cause, in response to selection of a the indicium, the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the a selected indicium, wherein the plurality of commands are written into a memory of the card.

Independent Claim 60 as amended is directed to a computer program which is seen to generally correspond with Claim 59.

A feature of the invention of Claims 59 and 60 therefore lies in writing, in regard to each indicium formed on a surface of a card, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, the plurality of commands being associated with each indicia and being used in a computer device to thereby cause, in response to selection of the indicium, the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, wherein the plurality of commands are written into a memory of the card. The applied references of Combaluzier, Redford, Masuzawa and Cohn are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As noted above, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of a card.

As such, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest writing, in regard to each indicium formed on a surface of a card, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, the plurality of commands being associated with each indicia and being used in a computer device to thereby cause, in response to selection of

the indicium, the equipment to perform the function corresponding to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, wherein the plurality of commands are written into a memory of the card.

In addition, Masuzawa and Cohn have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Combaluzier and Redford.

Allowance of Claims 59 and 60 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 63 and 64

Independent Claim 63 as amended is directed to a method for controlling equipment via a communication network by a computer device that communicates with a card reader, the card reader being configured to receive a card that has indicia formed on a surface thereof. The method comprises the step of communicating between the equipment which is external to the card and the computer device based on a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment, the plurality of commands being associated with a selected one of the indicia, and the plurality of commands being sent from a storage device on the card via the card reader to the computer device. The method also comprises the step of causing, according to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, the equipment to perform the corresponding function, via the communication network.

Independent Claim 64 as amended is directed to a computer program which is seen to generally correspond with Claim 63.

Thus, among its many features, the invention of Claims 63 and 64 provides for (i) communicating between equipment which is external to a card and a computer device based on a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment, a plurality of commands being associated with a selected indicium formed on a surface of the card,

and the plurality of commands being sent from a storage device on the card via a card reader to the computer device, and (ii) causing, according to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, the equipment to perform the corresponding function, via a communication network. The applied references of Combaluzier, Redford, Masuzawa and Cohn are not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

As noted above, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of a card.

As such, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest (i) communicating between equipment which is external to a card and a computer device based on a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment, a plurality of commands being associated with a selected indicium formed on a surface of the card, and the plurality of commands being sent from a storage device on the card via a card reader to the computer device, and (ii) causing, according to the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, the equipment to perform the corresponding function, via a communication network.

In addition, Masuzawa and Cohn have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Combaluzier and Redford.

Allowance of Claims 63 and 64 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 67

Independent Claim 67 as amended is directed to a computer device for communicating with equipment over a network, and for communicating with a card reader that receives a card, the equipment being external to the card, the card comprising (i)

selectable indicia on a surface of the card, and (ii) a storage device for storing, for each the indicium, a plurality of commands related to a function of the equipment. The computer device comprises a processor for (i) receiving from the card reader, while the card is inserted into the reader, and upon selection of one of the indicia, the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, and (ii) receiving a service based upon performance of the function by the equipment, the function being associated with the selected indicium.

Thus, among its many features, the invention of Claim 67 provides for (i) storing, for each indicium on a surface of a card, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, (ii) receiving from a card reader, while the card is inserted into the card reader, and upon selection of one of the indicia, the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, and (iii) receiving a service based upon performance of the function by the equipment, the function being associated with the selected indicium. The applied references of Combaluzier, Redford, Masuzawa and Cohn are not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

As noted above, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of a card.

As such, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest (i) storing, for each indicium on a surface of a card, a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment, (ii) receiving from a card reader, while the card is inserted into the card reader, and upon selection of one of the indicia, the plurality of commands associated with the selected indicium, and (iii) receiving a service based upon performance of the function by the equipment, the function being associated with the selected indicium.

In addition, Masuzawa and Cohn have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Combaluzier and Redford.

Allowance of Claim 67 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 68

Independent Claim 68 as amended is directed to a system comprising a set top box connected to an internet, and a card reader having a transparent touch sensitive membrane through which a plurality of indicia of an inserted card are visible, the card reader being adapted to communicate with the set top box. The card is adapted for insertion into the card reader, the card having (i) a storage device, (ii) the plurality of indicia on a surface of the card, and (iii) a plurality of commands, associated with each the indicium, stored in the storage device, the plurality of commands associating each of the plurality of indicia with corresponding web pages stored in a server connected to the Internet. The system also comprises a display that performs a function associated with corresponding commands associated with the selected indicium to thereby display a specific web page based upon the corresponding specific plurality of commands which the set top box receives from the card reader. The card reader reads, upon selection of a specific one of the indicia while the card is inserted in the card reader, the specific plurality of commands associated with the selected indicum, and transmits the specific plurality of commands required to display the specific web page to the set top box.

Thus, among its many features, the invention of Claim 68 provides for (i) a display that performs a function associated with corresponding commands associated with a selected indicium of a card, to thereby display a specific web page based upon the corresponding specific plurality of commands which a set top box receives from a card

reader, and that (ii) the card reader reads, upon selection of a specific one of the indicia while the card is inserted in the card reader, the specific plurality of commands associated with the selected indicum, and transmits the specific plurality of commands required to display the specific web page to the set top box. The applied references of Combaluzier, Redford, Masuzawa and Cohn are not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

As noted above, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest that a plurality of commands related to a function of equipment are associated with a selected indicium of a card.

As such, Combaluzier and Redford are not seen to disclose or suggest (i) a display that performs a function associated with corresponding commands associated with a selected indicium of a card, to thereby display a specific web page based upon the corresponding specific plurality of commands which a set top box receives from a card reader, and that (ii) the card reader reads, upon selection of a specific one of the indicia while the card is inserted in the card reader, the specific plurality of commands associated with the selected indicum, and transmits the specific plurality of commands required to display the specific web page to the set top box.

In addition, Masuzawa and Cohn have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Combaluzier and Redford.

Allowance of Claim 68 is therefore respectfully requested.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 46, 49, 52, 57 and 59 to 68 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent

claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 108251v2